

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-73, 75-76, 81, 84-88, 90-91, 96, 99-103, 105-106, 111, 114-118, 121-124, 127-130, 133-138, 147-148, and 157-158 are cancelled. Claims 74, 77-80, 82-83, 89, 92-95, 97-98, 104, 107-110, 112-113, 119-120, 125-126, 131-132, 139-146, 149-156, and 159-166 remain in this application and, as amended herein, are submitted for the Examiner's reconsideration.

A Request for Continued Examination (RCE) is submitted with the present Amendment.

Claims 82-83, 97-98, 112-113, 142-144, 152-154, and 162-164 have been amended solely to provide proper antecedence and to have the claims better conform to the requirements of U.S. practice. None of these amendments is intended to narrow the scope of any of these claims, and no new matter has been added by these amendments.

In the Office Action, claims 74-78, 80, 82, 83, 89-93, 95, 97, 98, 104-108, 110, 112, 113, 120, 126, and 132 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hishida (U.S. Patent No. 6,477,549) in view of Wang (U.S. Patent No. 6,675,385). Claims 75-76, 90-91, and 105-106 are cancelled. Applicant submits that the remaining claims are patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

Independent claims 74, 89, and 104 have each been amended to more clearly show the differences between the claimed features and the relied on sections of the references. For example, claim 74 recites:

decoding the received digital broadcast signals into AV data that includes visual and audio information and into supplementary data that includes content data written in a computer language format that includes extended markup language (XML) tags and having content attributes; [and]

obtaining at least one style sheet written in the computer language format that includes the extended markup language (XML) tags and including format information used to set the display format of images to be displayed by a given display device[.] (Emphasis added.)

The relied on sections of Hishida and the relied on sections of Wang do not disclose or suggest decoding received digital broadcast signals into AV data and into supplementary data that includes content data written in a computer language format that includes extended markup language (XML) tags, and the relied on sections of Hishida and the relied on sections of Wang do not disclose or suggest obtaining a style sheet written in a computer language format that includes extended markup language (XML) tags.

The relied on sections of Hishida merely describe a hypertext markup language (HTML) document created for transmitting documents containing both text and style sheets to a pager or a telephone. (See, e.g., Figs. 3-6.) The relied on sections of the reference neither disclose nor suggest digital broadcast signals formed of AV data and supplementary data that includes content data written in a computer language format that includes extended markup language (XML) tags, and the relied on sections of the reference neither disclose nor suggest a style sheet written in a computer language format that includes extended markup language (XML) tags.

The relied on sections of Wang do not address the deficiencies of the relied on sections of Hishida.

It follows that neither the relied on sections of Hishida nor the relied on sections of Wang, whether taken alone or in combination, disclose or suggest the method set out in claim 74, and claim 74 is therefore patentably distinct and unobvious over the cited references.

Independent claims 89 and 104 each include limitations similar to those set out above in the excerpt of claim 74. Therefore, claims 89 and 104 are each distinguishable over the relied on sections of Hishida and Wang for at least the same reasons.

Claims 77-78, 80, 82, 83, and 120 depend from claim 74; claims 92-93, 95, 97, 98, and 126 depend from claim 89; and claims 107-108, 110, 112, 113, and 132 depend from claim 104. Therefore each of these claims is distinguishable over the cited art for at least the same reasons as the claim from which it depends.

Claims 119, 125, and 131 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hishida and Wang as applied to claims 74, 89, and 104 above and further in view of Yogeshwar (U.S. Patent No. 6,026,232). Applicant submits that the claims are patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

Claim 119 depends from claim 74, claim 125 depends from claim 89, and claim 131 depend from claim 104. Therefore, each of these claims is distinguishable over Hishida and Wang for at least the same reasons.

Yogeshwar does not remedy these deficiencies.

Claims 79, 94, 109, 137-144, 146-154, 156-164, and 166 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hishida and Wang and further in view of Hill (U.S. Patent No. 6,023,714). Claims 137-138, 147-148, and 157-158 are cancelled. Applicant submits that the remaining claims are patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

Independent claims 79, 94 and 109, as amended, each include limitations similar to those set out above in the excerpt of claim 74. Therefore, each of claims 79, 94 and 109 is each distinguishable over Hishida and Wang for at least the same reasons.

Hill does not remedy these deficiencies.

Claims 139-144 and 146 depend from claim 79, claims 149-154 and 156 depend from claim 94, and claims 159-164, and 166 depend from claim 109. Each of these claims is therefore distinguishable over the cited art for at least the same reasons described above regarding the claim from which it depends.

Claims 145, 155, and 165 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hishida, Wang, and Hill as applied to claims 79, 94, and 109 above and further in view of Yogeshwar. Applicant submits that the claims are patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

Claim 145 depends from claim 79, claim 155 depends from claim 94, and claim 165 depends from claim 109. Therefore, each of these claims is distinguishable over Hishida, Wang, and Hill at least for the reasons described above regarding the claims from which it depends.

Yogeshwar does not remedy these deficiencies.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which the Examiner might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: October 31, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Lawrence E. Russ

Registration No.: 35,342
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP
600 South Avenue West
Westfield, New Jersey 07090
(908) 654-5000
Attorney for Applicant

818401_1.DOC